

Stochastic local operations and classical communication equations and classification of even n qubits¹

Xiangrong Li^a, Dafa Li^b

^a Department of Mathematics, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697-3875, USA

^b Department of mathematical sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084 CHINA

Abstract

For any even n qubits we establish four SLOCC equations and construct four SLOCC polynomials (not complete) of degree $2^{n/2}$, which can be exploited for SLOCC classification (not complete) of any even n qubits. In light of the SLOCC equations, we propose several different genuine entangled states of even n qubits and show that they are inequivalent to the $|GHZ\rangle$, $|W\rangle$, or $|l, n\rangle$ (the symmetric Dicke states with l excitations) under SLOCC via the vanishing or not of the polynomials. The absolute values of the polynomials can be considered as entanglement measures.

Keywords: entanglement measure, SLOCC entanglement classification.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Ud

1 Introduction

A fundamental concept in quantum information theory is the understanding of entanglement. Quantum entanglement can be viewed as a crucial resource in quantum information. The key question is how to quantify and classify entanglement of quantum states. Polynomial functions in the coefficients of pure states which are invariant under stochastic local operations and classical communication (SLOCC) transformations have been studied extensively [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] and exploited to construct entanglement measures [1, 2, 5, 12, 13, 14]. The concurrence [1] and three-tangle [2], which measure entanglement of two-qubit and three-qubit states, are polynomial invariants of degrees 2 and 4 respectively. It is known that the concurrence and three-tangle are the absolute values of hyperdeterminants for two and three qubits respectively [3]. An expression has recently been derived for four-tangle, which is a polynomial invariant and a measure of genuine entanglement of four-qubit states [4]. Polynomial invariants of degrees 2, 4 and 6 for four and five qubits have been constructed from classical invariant theory [5, 6]. The absolute values of the polynomial invariants obtained in [5] may be used to construct entanglement measures of four-qubit states. Further, polynomial invariants of degrees 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 for four and five qubits have been obtained using local invariant operators [7]. Despite these efforts, few attempts have so far been made towards the generalization to higher number of qubits. Three-tangle has been generalized to n -tangle for even n qubits [8] and has been shown to be equal to the square of the polynomial invariant of degree 2 [9]. A generalization of three-tangle to odd n qubits has been recently proposed in [10]. In [11], polynomial invariants of degree 2 for even n qubits and degree 4 for odd n qubits have been derived by induction based on the definition of SLOCC.

SLOCC classification of pure states has been under intensive research [3, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28]. For three qubits, two genuine entanglement states, namely the $|GHZ\rangle$ and $|W\rangle$ states, have been distinguished and characterized by the vanishing or not of the three-tangle [17]. For four or more qubits, the number of SLOCC classes is infinite. It is highly desirable to divide these infinite SLOCC classes into a finite number of families. Central to the issue is the criteria to determine which family an arbitrary state belongs to. Various methods have been undertaken to tackle the classification of four-qubit states, including those based on Lie group theory [18], on hyperdeterminant [3], on inductive approach [19], on string theory [20], and on polynomials (algebraic) invariants [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26]. Recently, the Majorana representation has been used for SLOCC entanglement classification of n -qubit symmetric states [27]. For n qubits, it is known that the $|l, n\rangle$ states (symmetric Dicke states with l excitations) are inequivalent to the $|GHZ\rangle$ state or the $|W\rangle$ state under SLOCC [28]. Therefore it is necessary to develop schemes to find other genuine entangled states which are inequivalent to the $|GHZ\rangle$, $|W\rangle$, or $|l, n\rangle$ states.

¹The paper was supported by NSFC(Grants No. 10875061, 60433050, and 60673034) and Tsinghua National Laboratory for Information Science and Technology.

In this paper, we establish four SLOCC equations and construct four SLOCC polynomials (not complete) of degree $2^{n/2}$ for any even n qubits. The equations are obtained from the polynomials (determinants) of the coefficients of the two SLOCC equivalent states by induction via direct manipulation of SLOCC definition. For $n = 4$, the SLOCC polynomials of degree $2^{n/2}$ reduce to the polynomials of degree 4 in [5]. In light of the SLOCC equations, we propose several different genuine SLOCC entanglement classes of even n qubits and show that they are inequivalent to the $|GHZ\rangle$, $|W\rangle$, or $|l, n\rangle$ (the symmetric Dicke states with l excitations) SLOCC classes via the vanishing or not of the polynomials.

The manuscript is organized as follows. In Sections 2, 3, 4 and 5, we construct SLOCC polynomials and present SLOCC equations of type I, II, III, and IV, respectively. We also discuss SLOCC classifications by means of these polynomials. In Section 6, we draw our conclusions.

2 SLOCC equation and polynomial of type I

Let $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\psi'\rangle$ be any states of n qubits. Then we can write

$$|\psi'\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} a_i |i\rangle, |\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} b_i |i\rangle,$$

where $\sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} |a_i|^2 = 1$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} |b_i|^2 = 1$. Two states $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\psi'\rangle$ are equivalent under SLOCC if and only if there exist invertible local operators $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ such that

$$|\psi'\rangle = \underbrace{\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{A}_n}_n |\psi\rangle. \quad (2.1)$$

For the state $|\psi'\rangle$ of even n qubits, let $\Theta(a, n)$ be the determinant of the coefficient matrix ($2^{n/2}$ by $2^{n/2}$) which is partitioned into blocks, *i.e.*

$$\Theta(a, n) = \left| \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_1 & \Theta_2 & \dots & \Theta_{2^{n/2}} \end{pmatrix} \right|, \quad (2.2)$$

where the blocks Θ_i , $i = 1, \dots, 2^{n/2}$, are the columns of the matrix and $\{\Theta_1^T \ \Theta_2^T \dots \Theta_n^T\}$ is just the coefficient vector $\{a_0 \ a_1 \dots a_{2^n-1}\}$.

To understand the structure of $\Theta(a, n)$, we list $\Theta(a, 4)$ below:

$$\Theta(a, 4) = \begin{vmatrix} a_0 & a_4 & a_8 & a_{12} \\ a_1 & a_5 & a_9 & a_{13} \\ a_2 & a_6 & a_{10} & a_{14} \\ a_3 & a_7 & a_{11} & a_{15} \end{vmatrix}, \quad (2.3)$$

which turns out to be the determinant L in [5].

Now, suppose that $|\psi'\rangle$ and $|\psi\rangle$ are equivalent under SLOCC. Then we get the following result:

$$\Theta(a, n) = \Theta(b, n) [\det(\mathcal{A}_1) \dots \det(\mathcal{A}_n)]^{2^{(n-2)/2}}, \quad (2.4)$$

where $\Theta(b, n)$ is obtained from $\Theta(a, n)$ by replacing a by b . Eq. (2.4) and $\Theta(a, n)$ are referred to as SLOCC equation and polynomial of type I for even n qubits, respectively. The proof of Eq. (2.4) for $n = 2$ can be seen as follows. Solving Eq. (2.1) yields $a_0 a_3 - a_1 a_2 = (b_0 b_3 - b_1 b_2) \det(\mathcal{A}_1) \det(\mathcal{A}_2)$ [11]. The desired result then follows by noting that $(a_0 a_3 - a_1 a_2)$ is the determinant $\Theta(a, 2)$ of the coefficients of states for two qubits. For $n \geq 4$, we refer the reader to Appendix A for the proof.

It follows from Eq. (2.4) that if one of $\Theta(a, n)$ and $\Theta(b, n)$ vanishes while the other does not, then the state $|\psi'\rangle$ is not equivalent to the state $|\psi\rangle$ under SLOCC.

We next demonstrate that $\Theta(a, n)$ vanishes for the $|GHZ\rangle$, $|W\rangle$ and Dicke states for $n > 2$. It is trivial to see that $\Theta(a, n)$ vanishes for the $|GHZ\rangle$ and $|W\rangle$ states. Recall that the n -qubit symmetric Dicke states with l excitations, where $1 \leq l \leq (n-1)$, were defined as [29]

$$|l, n\rangle = \sum_i P_i |1_1 1_2 \dots 1_l 0_{l+1} \dots 0_n\rangle, \quad (2.5)$$

where $\{P_i\}$ is the set of all the distinct permutations of the qubits. Note that $|1, n\rangle$ is just $|W\rangle$. For Dicke states $|l, n\rangle$, it is known that $|l, n\rangle$ and $|(n-l), n\rangle$ are equivalent to each other under SLOCC. Hence we

only need to consider $2 \leq l \leq n/2$. Inspection of the binary form of the subscripts of the entries in the second and third columns of $\Theta(a, n)$ reveals that those two columns are equal. Indeed, for $l < n/2$, we see that all the entries in the last column of $\Theta(a, n)$ vanish. It follows that $\Theta(a, n)$ vanishes for Dicke states as well.

Consider the following two states

$$|\chi_1\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2^{n/2}}) \left[\sum_{m=0}^{2^{n/2}-2} |(2^{n/2}+1)m\rangle - |2^n-1\rangle \right], \quad (2.6)$$

$$|\chi_2\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2^{n/2}}) \left[\sum_{m=1}^{2^{n/2}-1} |(2^{n/2}-1)m\rangle - |2^n-2^{n/2}\rangle \right]. \quad (2.7)$$

We observe that all the non-zero coefficients of $|\chi_1\rangle$ lie on the diagonal of $\Theta(a, n)$. This leads to non-vanishing $\Theta(a, n)$ for $|\chi_1\rangle$. Similarly, all the non-zero coefficients of $|\chi_2\rangle$ lie on the antidiagonal of $\Theta(a, n)$ and therefore $\Theta(a, n)$ does not vanish for $|\chi_2\rangle$. In light of Eq. (2.4), for $n > 2$, $|\chi_1\rangle$ and $|\chi_2\rangle$ are both different from the $|GHZ\rangle$, $|W\rangle$ and Dicke states under SLOCC. It can be further demonstrated that $|\chi_1\rangle$ and $|\chi_2\rangle$ are entangled, and that $|\chi_2\rangle$ is equivalent to $|\chi_1\rangle$ under SLOCC. We exemplify the result for the case of four qubits. We find that $|\chi_1\rangle = (1/2)(|0\rangle + |5\rangle + |10\rangle - |15\rangle)$ and it was shown in [23] that $|\chi_1\rangle$ is different from the $|GHZ\rangle$, $|W\rangle$, and Dicke states under SLOCC.

Remark 2.1. In $|\chi_1\rangle$ SLOCC entanglement class, the states $|\chi_1\rangle$ and $|\chi_2\rangle$ have the minimal number of product terms (*i.e.* $2^{n/2}$ product terms).

3 SLOCC equation and polynomial of type II

For the state $|\psi'\rangle$ of even n qubits, let $\Pi(a, n)$ be the determinant of the coefficient matrix ($2^{n/2}$ by $2^{n/2}$) which is partitioned into blocks, *i.e.*

$$\Pi(a, n) = \left| \begin{pmatrix} \Pi_1 \\ \Pi_2 \\ \vdots \\ \Pi_{2^{n/2}} \end{pmatrix} \right|, \quad (3.1)$$

where the blocks Π_i , $i = 1, \dots, 2^{n/2}$, are the rows of the matrix, $\{\Pi_1 \Pi_3 \dots \Pi_{2^{n/2}-1}\}$ is just the coefficient vector $\{a_0 \ a_2 \dots a_{2k} \dots a_{2^n-2}\}$, and $\{\Pi_2 \Pi_4 \dots \Pi_{2^{n/2}}\}$ is just the coefficient vector $\{a_1 \ a_3 \dots a_{2k+1} \dots a_{2^n-1}\}$.

To understand the structure of $\Pi(a, n)$, we list $\Pi(a, 4)$ below:

$$\Pi(a, 4) = \begin{vmatrix} a_0 & a_2 & a_4 & a_6 \\ a_1 & a_3 & a_5 & a_7 \\ a_8 & a_{10} & a_{12} & a_{14} \\ a_9 & a_{11} & a_{13} & a_{15} \end{vmatrix}, \quad (3.2)$$

which is equal to the determinant N in [5].

Now, suppose that $|\psi'\rangle$ and $|\psi\rangle$ are equivalent under SLOCC. Then we get the following result:

$$\Pi(a, n) = \Pi(b, n) [\det(\mathcal{A}_1) \dots \det(\mathcal{A}_n)]^{2^{(n-2)/2}}, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\Pi(b, n)$ is obtained from $\Pi(a, n)$ by replacing a by b . Eq. (3.3) and $\Pi(a, n)$ are referred to as SLOCC equation and polynomial of type II for even n qubits, respectively. For $n = 2$, Eq. (3.3) can be verified by directly solving Eq. (2.1). For $n \geq 4$, we refer the reader to Appendix B for the proof.

It follows from Eq. (3.3) that if one of $\Pi(a, n)$ and $\Pi(b, n)$ vanishes while the other does not, then the state $|\psi'\rangle$ is not equivalent to the state $|\psi\rangle$ under SLOCC.

Furthermore, it is trivial to see that $\Pi(a, n)$ vanishes for the $|GHZ\rangle$ and $|W\rangle$ states for $n > 2$. For Dicke states $|l, n\rangle$ ($l \geq 2$) for $n > 2$, $\Pi(a, n)$ vanishes as well owing to the fact that the second and third rows of $\Pi(a, n)$ are equal.

Consider the following two states

$$|\chi_3\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2^{n/2}}) \left[\sum_{m=0}^{2^{n/2-1}-2} (|2^{n/2+1}m + 4m\rangle + |2^{n/2+1}m + 4m + 3\rangle) + |2^n - 4\rangle - |2^n - 1\rangle \right], \quad (3.4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\chi_4\rangle &= (1/\sqrt{2^{n/2}}) \left[\sum_{m=1}^{2^{n/2-1}-1} (|2^{n/2+1}m - 4m + 2\rangle + |2^{n/2+1}m - 4m + 1\rangle) + |2^n - 2^{n/2+1} + 2\rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. - |2^n - 2^{n/2+1} + 1\rangle \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

An argument analogous to the one in section 2 shows that $\Pi(a, n)$ does not vanish for $|\chi_3\rangle$ or for $|\chi_4\rangle$. In light of Eq. (3.3), for $n > 2$, the states $|\chi_3\rangle$ and $|\chi_4\rangle$ are both different from the $|GHZ\rangle$, $|W\rangle$, and Dicke states under SLOCC. It can be further demonstrated that $|\chi_3\rangle$ and $|\chi_4\rangle$ are entangled, and that $|\chi_4\rangle$ is equivalent to $|\chi_3\rangle$ under SLOCC. We exemplify the result for the case of four qubits. We find that $|\chi_3\rangle = (1/2)(|0\rangle + |3\rangle + |12\rangle - |15\rangle)$ and it was shown in [23] that $|\chi_3\rangle$ is different from the $|GHZ\rangle$, $|W\rangle$, and Dicke states under SLOCC.

Remark 3.1. In light of Eq. (2.4), for $n > 2$, $|\chi_3\rangle$ is inequivalent to $|\chi_1\rangle$ under SLOCC, since we can show that $\Theta(a, n) = 0$ for $|\chi_3\rangle$ and $\Theta(a, n) \neq 0$ for $|\chi_1\rangle$.

Remark 3.2. For $|\chi_3\rangle$ SLOCC entanglement class, the states $|\chi_3\rangle$ and $|\chi_4\rangle$ have the minimal number of product terms (*i.e.* $2^{n/2}$ product terms).

4 SLOCC equation and polynomial of type III

For the state $|\psi'\rangle$ of even n qubits, let $\Gamma(a, n)$ be the determinant of the coefficient matrix ($2^{n/2}$ by $2^{n/2}$) which is partitioned into $2^{n/2+1} - 1$ by $2^{n/2-1}$ blocks, *i.e.*

$$\Gamma(a, n) = \left| \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_1 & \Gamma'_1 \\ \Gamma_2 & \Gamma'_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \Gamma_{2^{n/2}} & \Gamma'_{2^{n/2}} \end{pmatrix} \right|, \quad (4.1)$$

where the blocks Γ_i and Γ'_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{n/2}$, satisfy that $\{\Gamma_1 \Gamma_2 \dots \Gamma_{2^{n/2}}\}$ is just the coefficient vector $\{a_0 a_1 \dots a_{2^n-1}\}$, and $\{\Gamma'_1 \Gamma'_2 \dots \Gamma'_{2^{n/2}}\}$ is just the coefficient vector $\{a_{2^{n-1}} a_{2^{n-1}+1} \dots a_{2^n-1}\}$.

To understand the structure of $\Gamma(a, n)$, we list $\Gamma(a, 6)$ below:

$$\begin{vmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & a_{32} & a_{33} & a_{34} & a_{35} \\ a_4 & a_5 & a_6 & a_7 & a_{36} & a_{37} & a_{38} & a_{39} \\ a_8 & a_9 & a_{10} & a_{11} & a_{40} & a_{41} & a_{42} & a_{43} \\ a_{12} & a_{13} & a_{14} & a_{15} & a_{44} & a_{45} & a_{46} & a_{47} \\ a_{16} & a_{17} & a_{18} & a_{19} & a_{48} & a_{49} & a_{50} & a_{51} \\ a_{20} & a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} & a_{52} & a_{53} & a_{54} & a_{55} \\ a_{24} & a_{25} & a_{26} & a_{27} & a_{56} & a_{57} & a_{58} & a_{59} \\ a_{28} & a_{29} & a_{30} & a_{31} & a_{60} & a_{61} & a_{62} & a_{63} \end{vmatrix}. \quad (4.2)$$

Now, suppose that $|\psi'\rangle$ and $|\psi\rangle$ are equivalent under SLOCC. Then we get the following result:

$$\Gamma(a, n) = \Gamma(b, n) [\det(\mathcal{A}_1) \dots \det(\mathcal{A}_n)]^{2^{(n-2)/2}}, \quad (4.3)$$

where $\Gamma(b, n)$ is obtained from $\Gamma(a, n)$ by replacing a by b . Eq. (4.3) and $\Gamma(a, n)$ are referred to as SLOCC equation and polynomial of type III for even n qubits, respectively. For $n = 2$, Eq. (4.3) can be verified by directly solving Eq. (2.1). For $n \geq 4$, we refer the reader to Appendix C for the proof.

It follows from Eq. (4.3) that if one of $\Gamma(a, n)$ and $\Gamma(b, n)$ vanishes while the other does not, then the state $|\psi'\rangle$ is not equivalent to the state $|\psi\rangle$ under SLOCC.

Furthermore, it is trivial to see that $\Gamma(a, n)$ vanishes for the $|GHZ\rangle$ and $|W\rangle$ states for $n > 2$. For Dicke states $|l, n\rangle$ ($l \geq 2$) for $n > 2$, $\Gamma(a, n)$ vanishes as well owing to the fact that the second and third columns of $\Gamma(a, n)$ are equal.

Consider the following two states

$$|\chi_5\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2^{n/2}}) \left[\sum_{m=0}^{2^{n/2-1}-1} |(2^{n/2-1}+1)m\rangle + \sum_{m=0}^{2^{n/2-1}-2} |(2^{n/2-1}+1)m+3 \cdot 2^{n-2}\rangle - |2^n-1\rangle \right] \quad (4.4)$$

$$|\chi_6\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2^{n/2}}) \left[\sum_{m=1}^{2^{n/2-1}} |2^{n-1} + (2^{n/2-1}-1)m\rangle + \sum_{m=1}^{2^{n/2-1}-1} |2^{n-2} + (2^{n/2-1}-1)m\rangle - |2^{n-1} - 2^{n/2-1}\rangle \right]. \quad (4.5)$$

An argument analogous to the one in section 2 shows that $\Gamma(a, n)$ does not vanish for $|\chi_5\rangle$ or for $|\chi_6\rangle$. In light of Eq. (4.3), for $n > 2$, $|\chi_5\rangle$ and $|\chi_6\rangle$ are both different from the $|GHZ\rangle$, $|W\rangle$, and Dicke states under SLOCC. It can be further demonstrated that $|\chi_5\rangle$ and $|\chi_6\rangle$ are entangled, and that $|\chi_6\rangle$ is equivalent to $|\chi_5\rangle$ under SLOCC. We exemplify the result for the case of four qubits. We find that $\Gamma(a, 4) = \Pi(a, 4)$ and $|\chi_5\rangle = |\chi_3\rangle$.

Remark 4.1. In light of Eqs. (2.4) and (3.3), $|\chi_5\rangle$ is inequivalent to $|\chi_1\rangle$ for $n > 2$ or $|\chi_3\rangle$ for $n > 4$ under SLOCC, since we can show that $\Theta(a, n) = \Pi(a, n) = 0$ for $|\chi_5\rangle$, $\Theta(a, n) \neq 0$ for $|\chi_1\rangle$ and $\Pi(a, n) \neq 0$ for $|\chi_3\rangle$.

Remark 4.2. For $|\chi_5\rangle$ SLOCC entanglement class, the states $|\chi_5\rangle$ and $|\chi_6\rangle$ have the minimal number of product terms (*i.e.* $2^{n/2}$ product terms).

5 SLOCC equation and polynomial of type IV

For the state $|\psi'\rangle$ of even n qubits, let $\Omega(a, n)$ be the determinant of the coefficient matrix ($2^{n/2}$ by $2^{n/2}$) which is partitioned into $2^{n/2+1}-1$ by $2^{n/2-1}$ blocks, *i.e.*

$$\Omega(a, n) = \left| \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_1 & \Omega'_1 \\ \Omega_2 & \Omega'_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \Omega_{2^{n/2}} & \Omega'_{2^{n/2}} \end{pmatrix} \right|, \quad (5.1)$$

where the blocks Ω_i and Ω'_i satisfy

$$\{\Omega_1\Omega_2\Omega_5\Omega_6 \cdots \Omega_{4k+1}\Omega_{4k+2} \cdots \Omega_{2^{n/2-3}}\Omega_{2^{n/2-2}}\} = \{a_0, a_2, \cdots, a_{2^{n-1}-2}\}, \quad (5.2)$$

$$\{\Omega_3\Omega_4\Omega_7\Omega_8 \cdots \Omega_{4k+3}\Omega_{4k+4} \cdots \Omega_{2^{n/2-1}}\Omega_{2^{n/2}}\} = \{a_1, a_3, \cdots, a_{2^{n-1}-1}\}, \quad (5.3)$$

$$\{\Omega'_1\Omega'_2\Omega'_5\Omega'_6 \cdots \Omega'_{4k+1}\Omega'_{4k+2} \cdots \Omega'_{2^{n/2-3}}\Omega'_{2^{n/2-2}}\} = \{a_{2^{n-1}}, a_{2^{n-1}+2}, \cdots, a_{2^n-2}\}, \quad (5.4)$$

$$\{\Omega'_3\Omega'_4\Omega'_7\Omega'_8 \cdots \Omega'_{4k+3}\Omega'_{4k+4} \cdots \Omega'_{2^{n/2-1}}\Omega'_{2^{n/2}}\} = \{a_{2^{n-1}+1}, a_{2^{n-1}+3}, \cdots, a_{2^n-1}\}, \quad (5.5)$$

for $0 \leq k \leq 2^{n/2-2}-1$.

To understand the structure of $\Omega(a, n)$, we list $\Omega(a, 6)$ below:

$$\begin{vmatrix} a_0 & a_2 & a_4 & a_6 & a_{32} & a_{34} & a_{36} & a_{38} \\ a_8 & a_{10} & a_{12} & a_{14} & a_{40} & a_{42} & a_{44} & a_{46} \\ a_1 & a_3 & a_5 & a_7 & a_{33} & a_{35} & a_{37} & a_{39} \\ a_9 & a_{11} & a_{13} & a_{15} & a_{41} & a_{43} & a_{45} & a_{47} \\ a_{16} & a_{18} & a_{20} & a_{22} & a_{48} & a_{50} & a_{52} & a_{54} \\ a_{24} & a_{26} & a_{28} & a_{30} & a_{56} & a_{58} & a_{60} & a_{62} \\ a_{17} & a_{19} & a_{21} & a_{23} & a_{49} & a_{51} & a_{53} & a_{55} \\ a_{25} & a_{27} & a_{29} & a_{31} & a_{57} & a_{59} & a_{61} & a_{63} \end{vmatrix}. \quad (5.6)$$

Now, suppose that $|\psi'\rangle$ and $|\psi\rangle$ are equivalent under SLOCC. Then we get the following result:

$$\Omega(a, n) = \Omega(b, n) [\det(\mathcal{A}_1) \cdots \det(\mathcal{A}_n)]^{2^{(n-2)/2}}, \quad (5.7)$$

where $\Omega(b, n)$ is obtained from $\Omega(a, n)$ by replacing a by b . Eq. (5.7) and $\Omega(a, n)$ are referred to as SLOCC equation and polynomial of type IV for even n qubits, respectively. For $n = 2$, Eq. (5.7) can be verified by directly solving Eq. (2.1). For $n \geq 4$, we refer the reader to Appendix D for the proof.

It follows from Eq. (5.7) that if one of $\Omega(a, n)$ and $\Omega(b, n)$ vanishes while the other does not, then the state $|\psi'\rangle$ is not equivalent to the state $|\psi\rangle$ under SLOCC.

Furthermore, it is trivial to see that $\Omega(a, n)$ vanishes for the $|GHZ\rangle$ and $|W\rangle$ states for $n > 2$. For Dicke states $|l, n\rangle$ ($l \geq 2$) for $n > 2$, $\Omega(a, n)$ vanishes as well owing to the fact that the second and third columns of $\Omega(a, n)$ are equal.

Consider the following state

$$\begin{aligned}
|\chi_7\rangle = & (1/\sqrt{2^{n/2}}) \left[\sum_{m=0}^{2^{n/2-3}-1} (|2^{n/2+1}m + 8m\rangle + |2^{n/2+1}m + 8m + 3 \cdot 2^{n-2}\rangle) \right. \\
& + \sum_{m=0}^{2^{n/2-3}-1} (|(2m+1)2^{n/2} + 8m + 2\rangle + |(2m+1)2^{n/2} + 8m + 2 + 3 \cdot 2^{n-2}\rangle) \\
& + \sum_{m=0}^{2^{n/2-3}-1} (|2^{n/2+1}m + 8m + 5\rangle + |2^{n/2+1}m + 8m + 5 + 3 \cdot 2^{n-2}\rangle) \\
& + \sum_{m=0}^{2^{n/2-3}-1} (|(2m+1)2^{n/2} + 8m + 7\rangle + |(2m+1)2^{n/2} + 8m + 7 + 3 \cdot 2^{n-2}\rangle) \Big] \\
& - (2/\sqrt{2^{n/2}})|2^n - 1\rangle, \tag{5.8}
\end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq 6$ and $|\chi_7\rangle = (1/2)(|0\rangle + |6\rangle + |9\rangle - |15\rangle)$ for $n = 4$. An argument analogous to the one in section 2 shows that $\Omega(a, n)$ does not vanish for $|\chi_7\rangle$. In light of Eq. (5.7), for $n > 2$, $|\chi_7\rangle$ is different from the $|GHZ\rangle$, $|W\rangle$, and Dicke states under SLOCC. It can be further demonstrated that the state $|\chi_7\rangle$ is entangled. In particular, for four qubits, it was shown in [23] that $|\chi_7\rangle$ is different from the $|GHZ\rangle$, $|W\rangle$ and Dicke states under SLOCC. We further note that $|\chi_7\rangle = |\chi_5\rangle$ for the case of six qubits.

Remark 5.1. In light of Eqs. (2.4), (3.3), and (4.3), for $n > 2$, $|\chi_7\rangle$ is inequivalent to $|\chi_1\rangle$, $|\chi_3\rangle$, or $|\chi_5\rangle$ ($n \neq 6$ for $|\chi_5\rangle$) under SLOCC, since we can show that $\Theta(a, n) = \Pi(a, n) = \Gamma(a, n) = 0$ for $|\chi_7\rangle$.

Remark 5.2. For $|\chi_7\rangle$ SLOCC entanglement class, the state $|\chi_7\rangle$ has the minimal number of product terms (*i.e.* $2^{n/2}$ product terms).

6 Conclusion

In this paper, for even n qubits we have established four SLOCC equations and constructed four SLOCC polynomials of degree $2^{n/2}$. For $n = 4$, the SLOCC polynomials of degree $2^{n/2}$ reduce to the polynomials of degree 4 in [5]. For $n \geq 6$, the four SLOCC polynomials are linearly independent. The SLOCC equations can be exploited for SLOCC classification of any even n qubits. In light of the SLOCC equations, we have proposed several different genuine SLOCC entanglement classes of even n qubits and showed that they are inequivalent to the $|GHZ\rangle$, $|W\rangle$, or $|l, n\rangle$ (the symmetric Dicke states with l excitations) via the vanishing or not of the polynomials.

The concurrence and three-tangle, which measure entanglement of two-qubit and three-qubit states, have been known to be the absolute values of hyperdeterminants for two and three qubits respectively [3]. Recently, polynomial invariants have been proposed to construct entanglement monotones. The absolute values of the polynomial invariants obtained in [5] may be used to construct entanglement measures of four-qubit states. We expect that the absolute values of the polynomials in this paper can be considered as entanglement measures.

Appendix A. The proof for SLOCC equation of type I

Proof. We will prove Eq. (2.4) by induction principle. For the base case, letting $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A}_2 = \dots = \mathcal{A}_n = I$ in Eq. (2.1) yields $\Theta(a, n) = \Theta(b, n)$.

Let $|\phi\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} c_i |i\rangle$ and

$$|\phi\rangle = \underbrace{I \otimes \dots \otimes I}_{n} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{r+1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{A}_n |\psi\rangle. \tag{A1}$$

Assume that $\Theta(c, n) = \Theta(b, n) [\det(\mathcal{A}_{r+1}) \cdots \det(\mathcal{A}_n)]^{2^{(n-2)/2}}$, where $\Theta(c, n)$ is obtained from $\Theta(a, n)$ by replacing a by c . Next we will show that when

$$|\psi'\rangle = \underbrace{I \otimes \cdots \otimes I \otimes \mathcal{A}_r \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{A}_n}_n |\psi\rangle, \quad (\text{A2})$$

then

$$\Theta(a, n) = \Theta(b, n) [\det(\mathcal{A}_r) \cdots \det(\mathcal{A}_n)]^{2^{(n-2)/2}}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

It is easy to see that $|\psi'\rangle = \underbrace{I \otimes \cdots \otimes I \otimes \mathcal{A}_r \otimes I \cdots \otimes I}_n |\phi\rangle$. If we can prove that $\Theta(a, n) = \Theta(c, n) [\det(\mathcal{A}_r)]^{2^{(n-2)/2}}$, then we can finish the induction.

For readability, let $\mathcal{A}_{l+1} = \tau = \begin{pmatrix} \tau_1 & \tau_2 \\ \tau_3 & \tau_4 \end{pmatrix}$. Thus, we only need to prove that

$$\Theta(a, n) = \Theta(c, n) [\det(\tau)]^{2^{(n-2)/2}}, \quad (\text{A4})$$

whenever $|\psi'\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$ satisfy the following equation

$$|\psi'\rangle = \underbrace{I \otimes \cdots \otimes I}_l \otimes \tau \otimes \underbrace{I \otimes \cdots \otimes I}_{n-l-1} |\phi\rangle. \quad (\text{A5})$$

From Eq. (A5), we obtain

$$a_{2^{n-l}k+s} = \tau_1 c_{2^{n-l}k+s} + \tau_2 c_{2^{n-l}k+2^{n-l-1}+s}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$a_{2^{n-l}k+2^{n-l-1}+s} = \tau_3 c_{2^{n-l}k+s} + \tau_4 c_{2^{n-l}k+2^{n-l-1}+s}, \quad (\text{A7})$$

where $0 \leq k \leq 2^l - 1$ and $0 \leq s \leq 2^{n-l-1} - 1$.

We distinguish two cases.

Case 1. $0 \leq l \leq n/2 - 1$.

Let $A_{k,j}$ be a column of $\Theta(a, n)$ with entries $a_{2^{n-l}k+2^{n/2}j+q}$ where $0 \leq q \leq (2^{n/2} - 1)$, and let $A_{k,j}^*$ be a column obtained from $A_{k,j}$ by replacing each entry a_η by $a_{\eta+2^{n-l-1}}$. Then, the columns of $\Theta(a, n)$ are (from left to right)

$$\cdots, A_{k,j}, A_{k,j+1}, \cdots, A_{k,j}^*, A_{k,j+1}^*, \cdots, A_{k+1,j}, A_{k+1,j+1}, \cdots, A_{k+1,j}^*, A_{k+1,j+1}^*, \cdots, \quad (\text{A8})$$

where $0 \leq k \leq 2^l - 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq 2^{n/2-l-1} - 1$.

Note that $2^{n/2}j + q \leq 2^{n-l-1} - 1$. Substituting Eqs. (A6) and (A7) into $A_{k,j}$ and $A_{k,j}^*$ yields $A_{k,j} = \tau_1 C_{k,j} + \tau_2 C_{k,j}^*$ and $A_{k,j}^* = \tau_3 C_{k,j} + \tau_4 C_{k,j}^*$, where $C_{k,j}$ and $C_{k,j}^*$ are obtained from $A_{k,j}$ and $A_{k,j}^*$ by replacing a by c respectively. We see that $C_{k,j}$ and $C_{k,j}^*$ are columns of $\Theta(c, n)$.

To compute $\Theta(a, n)$, we first let $\mathcal{T}_{k,j}$ be either τ_1 or τ_2 , and let $\mathcal{T}_{k,j}^*$ be either τ_3 or τ_4 . Let $U_{k,j} = C_{k,j}$ if $\mathcal{T}_{k,j} = \tau_1$, and $U_{k,j} = C_{k,j}^*$ otherwise. Further, let $U_{k,j}^* = C_{k,j}$ if $\mathcal{T}_{k,j}^* = \tau_3$, and $U_{k,j}^* = C_{k,j}^*$ otherwise. Due to the multilinear property of determinant, $\Theta(a, n)$ is the sum of $2^{2^{n/2}}$ determinants, each of which consists of columns (from left to right):

$$\cdots, \mathcal{T}_{k,j} U_{k,j}, \mathcal{T}_{k,j+1} U_{k,j+1}, \cdots, \mathcal{T}_{k,j}^* U_{k,j}^*, \mathcal{T}_{k,j+1}^* U_{k,j+1}^*, \cdots, \mathcal{T}_{k+1,j} U_{k+1,j}, \mathcal{T}_{k+1,j+1} U_{k+1,j+1}, \cdots, \mathcal{T}_{k+1,j}^* U_{k+1,j}^*, \mathcal{T}_{k+1,j+1}^* U_{k+1,j+1}^*, \cdots,$$

where $0 \leq k \leq 2^l - 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq 2^{n/2-l-1} - 1$.

Denote t the product

$$\cdots \mathcal{T}_{k,j} \mathcal{T}_{k,j+1} \cdots \mathcal{T}_{k,j}^* \mathcal{T}_{k,j+1}^* \cdots \mathcal{T}_{k+1,j} \mathcal{T}_{k+1,j+1} \cdots \mathcal{T}_{k+1,j}^* \mathcal{T}_{k+1,j+1}^* \cdots$$

Clearly, each of the $2^{2^{n/2}}$ determinants can be written in the form $t \cdot \Delta$. Associated with each t is a determinant Δ which consists of columns (from left to right):

$$\cdots, U_{k,j}, U_{k,j+1}, \cdots, U_{k,j}^*, U_{k,j+1}^*, \cdots, U_{k+1,j}, U_{k+1,j+1}, \cdots, U_{k+1,j}^*, U_{k+1,j+1}^*, \cdots,$$

where $0 \leq k \leq 2^l - 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq 2^{n/2-l-1} - 1$.

We illustrate with an example. Let $t = \cdots \tau_1 \tau_1 \cdots \tau_4 \tau_4 \cdots \tau_1 \tau_1 \cdots \tau_4 \tau_4 \cdots$, whose power form is $(\tau_1 \tau_4)^{2^{(n-2)/2}}$, then $\Delta = \Theta(c, n)$.

For Eq. (A4) to hold, we need the following 3 results.

Result 1. Given t such that for some k, j , $\mathcal{T}_{k,j} = \tau_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_{k,j}^* = \tau_3$, or $\mathcal{T}_{k,j} = \tau_2$ and $\mathcal{T}_{k,j}^* = \tau_4$, then Δ vanishes.

Proof. If $\mathcal{T}_{k,j} = \tau_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_{k,j}^* = \tau_3$, then by definition $U_{k,j} = U_{k,j}^* = C_{k,j}$. We immediately see that Δ vanishes since Δ has two equal columns. Likewise, if $\mathcal{T}_{k,j} = \tau_2$ and $\mathcal{T}_{k,j}^* = \tau_4$, then by definition $U_{k,j} = U_{k,j}^* = C_{k,j}^*$ and therefore Δ vanishes.

Result 2. Given t such that for $0 \leq k \leq 2^l - 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq 2^{n/2-l-1} - 1$, $\mathcal{T}_{k,j} = \tau_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_{k,j}^* = \tau_4$, or $\mathcal{T}_{k,j} = \tau_2$ and $\mathcal{T}_{k,j}^* = \tau_3$ with m occurrences for each of τ_2 and τ_3 , then $\Delta = (-1)^m \Theta(c, n)$.

Proof. If $\mathcal{T}_{k,j} = \tau_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_{k,j}^* = \tau_4$ for some k, j , then by definition $U_{k,j} = C_{k,j}$ and $U_{k,j}^* = C_{k,j}^*$. These two columns of Δ are already in order and nothing needs to be done here. If $\mathcal{T}_{k,j} = \tau_2$ and $\mathcal{T}_{k,j}^* = \tau_3$, then by definition $U_{k,j} = C_{k,j}^*$ and $U_{k,j}^* = C_{k,j}$. To obtain $\Theta(c, n)$ from Δ , we need to interchange these two columns. It turns out that $\Theta(c, n)$ can be obtained from Δ by interchanging two columns for m times, i.e. $\Delta = (-1)^m \Theta(c, n)$.

Result 3. The number of t such that its power form is $(\tau_1 \tau_4)^i (\tau_2 \tau_3)^{2^{(n-2)/2}-i}$ is given by $\binom{2^{(n-2)/2}}{i}$.

Proof. With the help of *Result 1*, we only need to consider those t in which $\mathcal{T}_{k,j} = \tau_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_{k,j}^* = \tau_4$, or $\mathcal{T}_{k,j} = \tau_2$ and $\mathcal{T}_{k,j}^* = \tau_3$. In fact, we only need to count the number of occurrences of τ_1 and τ_2 in $\mathcal{T}_{k,0} \cdots \mathcal{T}_{k,j} \cdots \mathcal{T}_{k,2^{n/2-l-1}-1}$, where $0 \leq k \leq 2^l - 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq 2^{n/2-l-1} - 1$. It is readily seen that there are $\binom{2^{(n-2)/2}}{i}$ such cases, each of which contains i occurrences of τ_1 and $(2^{(n-2)/2} - i)$ occurrences of τ_2 .

It follows immediately from *Result 2* and *Result 3* that the sum of the $2^{2^{n/2}}$ determinants is given by $\Theta(c, n) [\det(\tau)]^{2^{(n-2)/2}}$. Therefore Eq. (A4) holds.

Case 2. $n/2 \leq l \leq (n-1)$.

Results analogous to *Result 1*, *Result 2* and *Result 3* can be derived by replacing “column” by “row”. Combining the above two cases, Eq. (A4) holds, and the proof is complete.

Appendix B. The proof for SLOCC equation of type II

Proof. By induction principle and the argument in Appendix A, we only need to prove that $\Pi(a, n) = \Pi(c, n) [\det(\tau)]^{2^{(n-2)/2}}$ when $|\psi'\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$ satisfy Eq. (A5).

We distinguish three cases.

Case 1. $0 \leq l \leq n/2 - 2$.

The proof is analogous to that in case 2 in Appendix A by investigating the rows of $\Pi(a, n)$.

Case 2. $n/2 - 1 \leq l \leq n - 2$.

The proof is analogous to that in case 1 in Appendix A by investigating the columns of $\Pi(a, n)$.

Case 3. $l = n - 1$.

In this case, Eqs. (A6) and (A7) become

$$a_{2k} = \tau_1 c_{2k} + \tau_2 c_{2k+1}, \quad (B1)$$

$$a_{2k+1} = \tau_3 c_{2k} + \tau_4 c_{2k+1}, \quad (B2)$$

where $0 \leq k \leq 2^{n-1} - 1$. The $(2r)th$ row of $\Pi(a, n)$ is given by $(a_{2^{n/2}2r}, a_{2^{n/2}2r+2}, \dots, a_{2^{n/2}(2r+2)-2})$, and the $(2r+1)th$ row of $\Pi(a, n)$ can be obtained from the $(2r)th$ row by replacing each entry a_η by $a_{\eta+1}$. The rest of the proof is analogous to that in case 2 in Appendix B.

Appendix C. The proof for SLOCC equation of type III

Proof. By induction principle and the argument in Appendix A, we only need to prove that $\Gamma(a, n) = \Gamma(c, n) [\det(\tau)]^{2^{(n-2)/2}}$ when $|\psi'\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$ satisfy Eq. (A5).

We distinguish three cases.

Case 1. $l = 0$.

The proof is analogous to that in case 1 in Appendix A by investigating the columns of $\Gamma(a, n)$.

Case 2. $1 \leq l \leq n/2$.

The proof is analogous to that in case 2 in Appendix A by investigating the rows of $\Gamma(a, n)$.

Case 3. $n/2 + 1 \leq l \leq n - 1$.

The proof is analogous to that in case 1 in Appendix A by investigating the columns of $\Gamma(a, n)$.

Appendix D. The proof for SLOCC equation of type IV

Proof. By induction principle and the argument in Appendix A, we only need to prove that $\Omega(a, n) = \Omega(c, n) [\det(\tau)]^{2^{(n-2)/2}}$ when $|\psi'\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$ satisfy Eq. (A5).

We distinguish four cases.

Case 1. $l = 0$.

The proof is analogous to that in case 1 in Appendix A by investigating the columns of $\Omega(a, n)$.

Case 2. $1 \leq l \leq n/2 - 1$.

The proof is analogous to that in case 2 in Appendix A by investigating the rows of $\Omega(a, n)$.

Case 3. $n/2 \leq l \leq n - 2$.

The proof is analogous to that in case 1 in Appendix A by investigating the columns of $\Omega(a, n)$.

Case 4. $l = n - 1$.

In this case, Eqs. (A6) and (A7) become Eqs. (B1) and (B2). Consider the $(4k+1)th$, the $(4k+2)th$, the $(4k+3)th$, and the $(4k+4)th$ ($0 \leq k \leq 2^{n/2-2} - 1$) rows of $\Omega(a, n)$, respectively. The rest of the proof is analogous to that in case 2 in Appendix A.

References

- [1] W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).
- [2] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052306 (2000).
- [3] A. Miyake, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012108 (2003).
- [4] S.S. Sharma and N.K. Sharma, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 012340 (2010).
- [5] J.-G. Luque and J.-Y. Thibon, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 042303 (2003).
- [6] J.-G. Luque and J.-Y. Thibon, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **39**, 371 (2006).
- [7] D.Z. Djoković and A. Osterloh, J. Math. Phys. **50**, 033509 (2009).
- [8] A. Wong and N. Christensen, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 044301 (2001).
- [9] X. Li and D. Li, Quantum Inf. Comput. **10**, 1018 (2010).
- [10] D. Li, arXiv:quant-ph/0912.0812.
- [11] D. Li, X. Li, H. Huang, and X. Li, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 032304 (2007) [arXiv:quant-ph/0704.2087].
- [12] D. Li, X. Li, H. Huang, and X. Li, J. Math. Phys. **50**, 012104 (2009).
- [13] A. Osterloh and J. Siewert, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 012337 (2005).
- [14] A. Osterloh and J. Siewert, Int. J. Quant. Inf. **4**, 531 (2006).
- [15] M.S. Leifer, N. Linden, and A. Winter, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 052304 (2004).
- [16] P. Lévy, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **39**, 9533 (2006).
- [17] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J.I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 062314 (2000).
- [18] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, B. De Moor, and H. Verschelde, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052112 (2002).
- [19] L. Lamata, J. León, D. Salgado, and E. Solano, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 022318 (2007).
- [20] L. Borsten, D. Dahanayake, M.J. Duff, A. Marrani, and W. Rubens, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 100507 (2010).
- [21] O. Chterental and D.Z. Djoković, in Linear Algebra Research Advances, edited by G.D. Ling (Nova Science Publishers, Inc., Hauppauge, NY, 2007), Chap. 4, 133.
- [22] Y. Cao and A.M. Wang, Eur. Phys. J. D **44**, 159 (2007).

- [23] D. Li, X. Li, H. Huang, and X. Li, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 052311 (2007).
- [24] D. Li, X. Li, H. Huang, and X. Li, Quantum Inf. Comput. **9**, 0778 (2009).
- [25] R.V. Buniy and T.W. Kephart, arXiv:quant-ph/1012.2630.
- [26] O. Viehmann, C. Eltschka, and J. Siewert, arXiv:quant-ph/1101.5558.
- [27] T. Bastin, S. Krins, P. Mathonet, M. Godefroid, L. Lamata, and E. Solano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 070503 (2009).
- [28] D. Li, X. Li, H. Huang, and X. Li, EPL **87**, 20006 (2009).
- [29] J.K. Stockton, J.M. Geremia, A.C. Doherty, and H. Mabuchi, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 022112 (2003).